

Electronically filed		
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT</b></p> <p>Address to: Mail Stop Amendment Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450</p>	Docket No.	UCSD-292
	Confirmation No.	1602
	Application No.	10/697,817
	Filing Date	October 29, 2003
	Examiner	M.S. Horning
	Group Art Unit	1648
	Title	<i>Methods of treating pulmonary fibrotic disorders</i>

Sir:

This communication is submitted in response to the Office Action mailed August 24, 2006. The Office Action set forth a one-month time period for response, making a response due on or before September 24, 2006. *A Petition for a one-Month Extension of Time is submitted herewith, making this amendment due on or before October 24, 2006.* Accordingly, this response is timely filed.

#### I. REMARKS

The Office Action set forth a Restriction Requirement and an Election of Species requirement.

##### Restriction Requirement

In the Restriction Requirement, the Examiner required election of one of the following groups of claims:

Group I: claims 1-17; and

Group II: claims 18-23.

Applicants hereby elect to prosecute the claims of Group I, claims 1-17, with traverse. As stated in the MPEP §803, if search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine the entire application on the merits, even though the entire application includes claims to independent or distinct inventions. It is Applicants' position that it would not be unduly burdensome to perform a search on all of the